DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 075 CS 503 171

AUTHOR Prisbell, Marshall; Dallinger, Judith
TITLE Interpersonal Perceptions and Relationship--Types.
PUB DATE Nov 80
NOTE 59p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (66th, New York, NY, November 13-16, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; *Communication Research; *Interpersonal Attraction; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Perception

ABSTRACT

A study examined the relationship of interpersonal perceptual variables to communication contexts, specifically relationship types. The variables examined were (1) interpersonal solidarity, (2) perceived homophily, (3) uncertainty reduction, (4) feeling good, (5) interpersonal attraction, (6) relational safety, and (7) self-disclosure. The communication context relationship types were intimate, friendship, casual acquaintance, and business/professional. A sample composed of 75 teachers, 61 college students, 18 child development specialists, and 8 members of a service club completed instruments assessing each of the perceptual variables with a specific target person in mind. The findings showed that, in general, use of the contextual variable in communication situations was helpful in providing a more complete understanding of the perceptual variables that operate between communication participants. More specifically, they indicated that knowledge of the nature of the communication context in terms of specific relationship types explained a significant proportion of the variance present within several perceptual variables. (Copies of the assessment instruments are appended.) (FI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196075

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTIONS AND RELATIONSHIP - TYPES

MARSHALL PRISBELL
and
JUDITH DALLINGER

Department of Speech Communication
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588
(402) 472-3348

Abstract

Results of the present investigation indicated, in general, that utilization of the contextual variable in communication situations is useful in providing a more complete understanding of the perceptual variables which operate between communication participants. More specifically, knowledge of the nature of the communication context in terms of specific relationship-types, including intimate, friendship, casual acquaintance, and business/professional, has been found to explain a significant proportion of the variance present within several perceptual variables.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marshall Prisbell
Judith Dallinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association Convention, New York, 1980

Interpersonal Perceptions and Relationship-Types

Abstract

Results of the present investigation indicated, in general, that utilization of the contextual variable in communication situations is useful in providing a more complete understanding of the perceptual variables which operate between communication participants. More specifically, knowledge of the nature of the communication context in terms of specific relationships-types, including intimate, friendship, casual acquaintance, and business/professional, has been found to explain a significant proportion of the variance present within several perceptual variables.

Communication researchers have consistently concerned themselves with the study of interpersonal perceptions which individuals have of one another. For the most part, however, such interpersonal research has failed to acknowledge the relationship between perceptual variables and perceived relationship-type. Most typically, research has assessed the linkage between person perception constructs to that of all communication contexts, without establishing how those perceptions differed according to the nature of the specific relationship-type. Thus, previous empirical findings have been far from promising in understanding how individuals perceive different communication contexts. One needs to investigate the

interrelationships among a number of perception variables (i.e., interpersonal attraction, perceived homophily, uncertainty reduction, etc.) and communication contexts (Garrison & Powell, 1977; Bodaken & Weiner, 1977; Bodaken & Wenburg, 1977; Garrison & Pate, 1977; Garrison, Sullivan, & Pate, 1976; Snavely, Merker, Becker, & Book, 1976).

Of particular concern in this investigation were the following elements crucial to the development and understanding of perceptual differences among communication contexts: perceived homophily (McCroskey, Richmond, & Daly, 1975), interpersonal attraction (McCroskey & McCain, 1973), uncertainty reduction (Berger & Calabrese, 1975), feeling good (Prisbell, 1979), relational safety (Prisbell & Andersen, 1979), and self-disclosure (Wheeless, 1978). All of these constructs have been previously noted as important in the development, maintenance, and escalation of interpersonal relationships (Prisbell & Andersen, 1979). A discussion of their relationships to communication contexts follows.

COMMUNICATION CONTEXT

The current literature and empirical research regarding relationship context and its influence on individuals' communication behaviors are relatively scarce in the communication discipline. Garrison and Powell (1977) state that "an explanation of how communication is directly influenced by context" is well needed in the investigation of interpersonal relationships. Further, Garrison and Powell (1977) cite Nimmo (1974, p. 43) as concluding that:

> (1) in every communication participants offer definition of their relationship which they hope will structure their relationship; (2) participants do this through messages that emphasize similarities and/or differences in status and affection; (3) each person confirms, rejects, ignores, or modifies the image of the

other; and (4) once relationships are established they form a context within which participants define the meaning of the context of the messages they exchange.

Thus, researchers need to not only regard those interpersonal perception variables which are operative in ongoing relationships, but they also need to recognize the relation of those behaviors in reference to interpersonal contexts. Those contexts being relationship-types (i.e., intimate, friendship, casual acquaintance, and business/professional). In sum, one can conclude that communication behaviors are directly influenced by the communication context which encompasses them.

Interpersonal Solidarity and Relationship-Type

Wheeless (1977) states that, "solidarity references the affective nature of interpersonal relationships" (p. 3). Interpersonal solidarity has been discussed as "being close or remote, near or far, the in-group versus the out-group" (Brown, 1965, p. 57). Also, Wheeless (1976) stated that, "solidarity relationships refer to those in which 'closeness' derived from 'similarity' finds expression in sentiments, behaviors, and symbols of that closeness" (p. 3). In addition, Scott and Powers (1978) regard solidarity as "the degree to which people perceive themselves as being close to or remote from one another" (p. 233). Finally, Garrison (1978) operationalizes interpersonal solidarity as, "the dyadic process of affective development in a relationship, based on person perceptions, and the proximal or proximate nature of the interpersonal communication involved" (p. 60). Thus, one can conclude that a soldiary relationship reflects the degree of psychological, social, and physical closeness between individuals (Wheeless, 1977; Miller & Steinberg, 1975).

In specific regard to interpersonal solidarity, a highly soldiary

relationship is characterized or based on five categories (Brown, 1965; Wheeless, 1976). These five categories pertain to: (1) personal characteristics which are referenced in terms of attitude and value similarities (Scott & Powers, 1978); (2) spatial relations - which relate to the maintenance of close proximity (Scott & Powers, 1978); (3) sentiments - which reference mutual trust, affection, and respect; (4) behaviors - which include "cooperation, frequent intention, confiding in one another, beneficient actions, etc." (Wheeless, 1977, p. 3); and (5) symbols - which are indicants of closeness, such as, "wedding rings, secret symbols, secret handclasps, etc." (Wheeless, 1977, p. 3). Thus, interpersonal solidarity seems to represent those dyadic relationships which are perceived as close in nature. Moreover, Brown (1965) concluded that solidarity is operative in close friends and intimates (p. 58). In addition, it seems that the development of interpersonal solidarity would not be operative in acquaintance and co-worker relationships because those relationships are more distant in nature. Finally, Wheeless and Andersen (1978) and Garrison and Powell (1977) have found support that solidarity does indeed operate in closer relationships than in relationships of a more distant fashion. Thus the following hypotheses were examined:

H1: Interpersonal solidarity is significantly related to a linear combination of relationship-types.

Also,

interpersonal solidarity will significantly differ for comparisons between relationship-types,

Such that,

H1a: Intimate relationships are significantly greater than casual acquaintances

H1b: Friendship relationships are significantly greater than casual acquaintances

H1c: Intimate relationships are significantly greater than business/professional

H1d: Friendship relationships are significantly greater than business/professional

Perceived Homophily and Relationship-types

Perceived homophily is "the degree to which pairs of individuals who interact are similar with respect to certain attributes, such as beliefs, values, education, social status, and the like" (Rogers & Bhowmik, 1971, p. 526). More recently, perceived homophily has been defined as a multidimensional construct assessing perceived similarity between people along the dimensions of attitude, background, value, and appearance (McCroskey, Richmond, & Daly, 1975).

Previous research has demonstrated that perceived homophily leads to more frequent and effective interaction. More specifically, Prisbell and Andersen (1979) concluded that perceived attitude - value homophily has moderately-high independent predictive power concerning uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety. Perceived background homophily and perceived appearance homophily have little or no independent predictive power to those dependent variables.

Finally, it is concluded that since perceived homophily is moderately related to uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety that perceived homophily is, also, an excellent predictor and possibly a potential cause of continuing interaction in relationship development.

Since perceived homophily has been closely associated with interpersonal solidarity and since perceived attitude-value homophily has also been posited as leading to more frequent and effective interaction, it seems plausible that there would be a greater amount of perceived homophily for closer relationships than more distant ones. Thus, the following hypotheses were investigated:

H2: Perceived attitude-value homophily is significantly related to a linear combination of relationship-types.

Also,

perceived attitude-value homophily will significantly differ for comparisons between relationship-types

Such that,

H2a: Intimate relationships are significantly greater than casual acquaintances

H2b: Friendship relationships are significantly greater than casual acquaintances

H2c: Intimate relationships are significantly greater than business/ professional

H2d: Friendship relationships are significantly greater than business/ professional

Uncertainty Reduction and Relationship-types

In developing a theoretical system to explain initial interaction phenomena, Berger and Calabrese (1975) assert that when two individuals meet for the first time, their levels of uncertainty about each other and themselves are relatively high. Uncertainty is generated because persons can behave and believe in a number of alternative ways which makes accurate prediction of behavior and beliefs difficult. Furthermore, uncertainty is high because the individuals establishing and forming the relationship have not had an opportunity to interact with one another. In sum, uncertainty is high during initial encounters because prediction of future behavior is difficult and no knowledge factors have been exchanged between the dyadic pair.

Uncertainty reduction has been previously established as an important concept in relationship development (Berger & Calabrese, 1975). Uncertainty has been noted as partially being reduced by individuals perceiving themselves as having similar attitudes (Berger & Calabrese, 1975; Berger & Clatterbuck, 1976; Prisbell and Andersen, 1979).

In addition, Berger and Calabrese (1975) posit in Axiom form that low levels of uncertainty produce high levels of intimacy. Thus, one characteristic of a developing relationship is that of intimacy (Knapp, 1978; Berger & Larimer, 1974; Larimer & Berger, 1974; Altman & Taylor, 1973; Berger, 1973b;

Cozby, 1972) in terms of self-disclosure behaviors/communication (Wheeless, 1978; Pearce & Sharp, 1973; Jourard, 1971, 1964, 1959).

Moreover, Berger and Calabrese (1975) suggest that continued interaction decreases uncertainty. It seems that amount of continued interaction is regulated by the nature of the relationship. Thus, individuals involved in a close relationship would spend more time interacting disclosive topics than they would in a more distant relationship. Thus, the following hypotheses were investigated:

H3: Uncertainty reduction is significantly related to a linear combination of relationship-types.

Also,

uncertainty reduction will significantly differ for comparisons between relationship-types,

Such that,

H3a: Intimate relationships are significantly greater than casual acquaintances

H3b: Friendship relationships are significantly greater than casual acquaintances

H3c: Intimate relationships are significantly greater than business/ professional

H3d: Friendship relationships are significantly greater than business/ professional

Feeling Good and Relationship-type

Feeling good is another salient interpersonal variable that might differ among relationship-types according to the perception which individuals have of one another.

"Feeling good is a temporarily enhanced self-concept derived from peak experiences (Maslow, 1968), positive experiencing (Landsmen, 1973) and over-all rewarding interactions" (Prisbell & Andersen, 1979, p. 5). Measurement and further conceptual development for this construct are reported by Prisbell (1979).

Research by Festinger (1954), Pettigrew (1967), Merton (1957), and Rogers (1959) suggest that individuals structure their interactions to derive feelings of self-worth. Prisbell (1980) found that individuals who perceived a high degree of solidarity in their relationships, also perceived a high degree of "feeling good." Feeling good has also been established as a moderately-good criterion of perceived homophily (Prisbell & Andersen, 1979). Since feeling good has been demonstrated as operative in close interpersonal relationships, the following hypotheses needed to be investigated:

H4: Feeling good is significantly related to a linear combination of relationship-types.

Also,

Feeling good will significantly differ for comparisons between relationship-types.

Such that,

H4a: Intimate relationships are significantly greater than casual acquaintances

H4b: Friendship relationships are significantly greater than casual acquaintances

H4c: Intimate relationships are significantly greater than Business/ Professional

H4d: Friendship relationships are significantly greater than Business/ Professional

Interpersonal Attraction and Relationship-types

Interpersonal attraction is another potential variable that might be perceived by individuals differently according to the nature or type of relationship being observed. Attraction has been long assembled by a host of scholars (Heider, 1946; Newcomb, 1961, 1963; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959; Byrne, 1971; Berscheid & Walster, 1969, 1978). Also, a myriad of conceptualizations of attraction have been posited by those same researchers. For instance, Byrne (1971) conceptualized attraction as the management of rewards. Further,

Byrne (1971) claimed that attraction between people was a function of the extent to which the interactants could reciprocally provide rewards. On a more simplistic level, Berscheid and Walster (1978) suggested that interpersonal attraction was a positive attitude toward another. They (1978) contended that attraction can be defined as ". . . .an individual's tendency or predisposition to evaluate another person or the symbol of the person in a positive (or negative) way" (Bersheid & Walster, 1978, p. 3-4). The above conceptualizations treated attraction as a unidimensional construct. Other researchers have demonstrated that attraction is multidimensional in nature. Specifically, McCroskey and McCain (1972) demonstrated that attraction was composed of three dimensions: social, physical, and task.

One reason why individuals interpersonally communicate with one another is to enhance the perceived interpersonal attraction between them. Communication researchers have previously posited that individuals who are attracted toward one another also choose to frequently interact with one another (McCroskey & Wheeless, 1976). Additional empirical findings suggest that individuals who perceive their relationship to be high in interpersonal solidarity also perceive one another as being attractive on the social, physical, and task dimension (Prisbell, 1980). Thus, attraction implies frequent interaction as well as a perceived psychological and physical closeness in interpersonal relationships.

However, the perceived variation which interpersonal attraction holds for individuals in various communication contexts or relationships has not been carefully researched. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that attraction will be perceived differently by individuals according to the type of relationships they are involved in. Thus, the following hypotheses were under investigation:

H5: Interpersonal attraction variables taken independently are

significantly related to a linear combination of relationship-types

Also,

Social, physical, and task attraction taken independently will significantly differ for comparison between relationship-types,

such that,

H5a: Intimate relationships are significantly greater than casual acquaintances

H5b: Friendship relationships are significantly greater than casual acquaintances

H5c: Intimate relationships are significantly greater than Business/ Professional, except for the task attraction dimension

H5d: Friendship relationships are significantly greater than Business/ Professional, except for the task attraction dimension

Relational Safety and Relationship-types

Another interpersonal perception variable which might be differentiated by individuals according to the type of relationship is that of relational safety. Safety is conceptualized as describing a relationship which is safe, secure, straightforward, non-threatening and logical. Previous research has shown that perceived homophily is moderately related to safety, accounting for forty-six percent of the variance. Specifically, perceived attitude-value homophily accounted for twenty-nine percent of the unique variance in safety when entered into a simulation regression model. Perceived background and appearance homophily accounted for less than one percent and one percent of the variance, respectively when also entered into a simulateous regression model (Prisbell & Andersen, 1979). In addition, safety has been shown to have somewhat low but significant relationships to that of depth of self-disclosure, amount of self-disclosure and honesty of self-disclosure (Prisbell, 1978).

It has already been established that perceived homophilous people feel

safety in their relationship with each other, since it has also been previously argued in this paper that homophily will be perceived by individuals as being different according to the nature of the relationship, it seems logical to assume that relational safety will also differ among relationship-types. Thus, the following hypotheses were examined:

H6: Relational safety is significantly related to a linear combination of relationship-types

Also

Relational safety will significantly differ for comparisons between relationship-types,

Such that,

H6a: Intimate relationships are significantly greater than casual acquaintances

H6b: Friendship relationships are significantly greater than casual acquaintances

H6c: Intimate relationships are significantly greater than Business/ Professional

H6d: Friendship relationships are significantly greater than Business/ Professional

Self-Disclosure and Relationship-types

A final perceptual construct which was examined in this study was that of self-disclosure. Self-disclosure is a form of intimate communication which is exchanged among individuals. Wheeless and Grotz (1976) have previously conceptualized self-disclosive communication as being:

> A self-disclosure is any message about the self that a person communicates to another. Consequently, any message or message unit may potentially vary in the degree of self-disclosure present depending upon the perception of the message by those involved (p. 338).

For an indepth review of literature regarding self-disclosure see Prisbell and Andersen (1979), Wheeless (1978), Cozby (1973), and Pearce and Sharp (1973).

Previous research has associated self-disclosure with solidary-type relationships which are accompanied by trust (Wheeless, 1978). Furthermore, in conceptualizing an ongoing or continuing relationship, Knapp (1978), Berger and Calabrese (1975) and Altman and Taylor (1973) conclude that interpersonal relationships build toward intimacy. One should note that self-disclosure is a necessary behavior of a continuing intimate relationship (Wheeless, 1978; Jourard, 1959). Jourard (1959) concluded that self-disclosure is a healthy act which can produce and form a foundation for establishing a close interpersonal relationship. Taylor and Altman (1966) regard self-disclosure as a process in which relationships proceed from nonintimate to intimate areas of exchange with regard to content. Thus, one can conclude that intimacy within dyadic relationships involves self-disclosive communication. More so, self-disclosive behaviors should occur more frequently in relationships which are perceived as close than relationships perceived as more distant in nature, therefore, the following hypotheses were critically investigated:

H7: Self-disclosure variables, taken independently, are significantly related to a linear combination of relationship-type variables

Also,

Self-disclosure variables will significantly differ for comparisons between relationship-types

Such that,

H7a: Intimate relationships are significantly greater than casual acquaintances

H7b: Friendship relationships are significantly greater than casual acquaintances

H7c: Intimate relationships are significantly greater than business/professional

H7d: Friendship relationships are significantly greater than business/professional

Method

Subject Selection and Procedures

An attempt was made to enhance the generalizability of results produced in the present investigation by including in the subject pool, four distinct smaples drawn form diversified target populations. Composition of those samples was limited to adults under the assumption that older people would be more able to draw upon and provide information about previous relational experiences.

Subject Sample

The initial sample included 400 elementary and secondary education teachers enrolled in off-campus extension courses through a large Eastern university. Questionnaires, as well as explanatory information about the study, were mailed to each of the extension students. A return rate of 19% provided this investigation with 75 teachers in this sample.

The second sample contained students from a large Eastern university who were enrolled in introductory speech communication classes during one summer semester. In this case, questionnaires were distributed by the class instructor and participation was voluntary. Sixty-one students completed the questionnaire.

The third sample consisted of ten child-development professionals who attended a communication workshop. Workshop members were asked to take additional packets for any people they knew (such as spouse, co-worker, friend, etc.) who might be willing to participate in the study. A total of 30 packets were distributed and 18 were mailed back completed.

The final sample included 20 members of a local Lions Club. Questionnaires were distributed at a meeting and eight packets were returned through the mail.

Thus, the total N for this investigation was 162.

Procedures

Each subject received a research packet containing instruments assessing relationship type, interpersonal solidarity, perceived homophily, uncertainty reduction, feeling good, relational safety, interpersonal attraction, and self-disclosure. Instruments utilized in the present investigation were obtained as a part of a previous investigation and therefore constituted only a part of a larger research packet. Each packet instructed the subject to complete the scales with a given specific target person in mind. Fourteen target persons were selected on the basis of their potential closeness or social distance from the subjects.[1]

Each packet further contained a second target person to be utilized if a subject did not know a specific person who would fit into the first target person category. Also included were directions for the completion of each instrument. Completed packets were returned anonymously through the mail, except for the student sample which was returned anonymously to the instructor.

Operationalizations of Experimental Measures

Criteria for Scale Construction and Validation

All scales were constructed and/or validated with three different but concurrent statistical considerations: item-total correlations, internal reliability estimates and factor analysis.

For all factor analysis an eigenvalue of 1.0 was established as a guideline for the extraction of an additional factor and the Scree procedure was employed in order to determine the number of "valid" factors present within the eighenvalue of 1.0 guideline. In all orthogonal factor analyses performed in this investigation, a factor was considered meaningful if two or more items

loaded on that factor above .60 and less than .40 on other factors. After the extraction of two or more items utilizing the 60/40 criterion, if an item failed to load .60 on any factor but had its highest loading account for twice the variance of the second highest loading, then the item was also considered to be part of that factor. In all oblique factor analyses performed in this investigation, a factor was considered meaningful if two or more items loaded on that factor above .40 and the factor loading accounted for twice the variance of any secondary loadings. Increased internal reliability was the ultimate consideration for determining factor structure in that any items which decreased reliabilities would be deleted from the scale. Dimensional structures consistent with conceptualization were sought but all other statistically meaningful structures were examined. Items failing to meet statistical criteria and not constituting another viable factor would be deleted. Reliabilities for each instrument were computed utilizing the Spearman-Brown and Nunally formulas (Wood, 1960; Nunnally, 1967, 193-194).[2]

Independent Variables

Subjects were instructed to classify their relationship with the specific target person to whom they referenced the completion of the scales. Relationship with target persons were identified as intimate, friendship, casual acquaintance, business/professional, or other (see Table 1 for scale summary statistics).

Dependent Variables

Operationalization of Perceived Interpersonal Solidarity

A 25-item version, seven-interval, Likert-type measure was utilized to measure perceived interpersonal solidarity (Wheeless, 1977; Wheeless & Andersen, 1978; Garrison & Powell, 1977) (see Figure A for the 25-item version).[3]

Previous research utilizing the 20-item version consistently reported a uni dimensional solution with a split-half, internal reliability estimate of .97 (Wheeless & Andersen, 1978). Since factor analysis and reliability estimates had not been computed for the 25-item version, the interpersonal solidarity scale was, thus, submitted to principal components factor analysis.

Factor analysis of the interpersonal solidarity instrument produced an unrotated unidimensional solution (see Table 2 for factor loadings) with all items loading above .58. One item, however, loaded higher on a second factor than on the first and it appeared to not be operating as conceptualized. Therefore, this item was deleted and another factor analysis was performed (see Table 2). This unrotated solution yielded a unidimensional solution with all items loading above .58 with this solution accounting for 62% of the variance in the items (see Table 2). Split-half reliability of .96 was computed for the revised 24-item instrument (see Table 1 for scale summary statistics).

Operationalization of Perceived Homophily

Perceived homophily was measured with a 16-item, seven-interval, semantic differential-type instrument developed by McCroskey, Richmond, and Daly (1975) (see Figure B). Factor analysis of the 16-item scale demonstrated a three-factor solution: attitude-value homophily, background homophily, and appearance homophily (see Table 3). Reliabilities using Nunnally's (1967) internal reliability formula on each dimension of the perceived homophily measure were the following: attitude-value homophily = .90, background homophily = .73, and appearance homophily = .82 (see Table 3 for scale summary statistics).

Operationalization of Uncertainty Reduction

Scales measuring uncertainty reduction were developed specifically for this investigation. Previous literature by Berger and Clatterbuck (1976), Clatterbuck (1976), Clatterbuck and Turner (1978), and Lester (1978) suggest

one possible measurement for uncertainty reduction, the Clatterbuck Uncertainty Evaluation Scale (CLUES, 1976). However, this scale was not suitable for this investigation for two reasons. First, the items did not meet the conceptualization of uncertainty reduction in this report. CLUES items assess a person's ability to predict specific things about another person and this report dealt with how knowledgeable and/or predictive one person was about an overall relationship with another person. Second, items such as "knowing a person's lucky number" did not seem to have face validity when analyzing "how well you know a person." A person may know another person quite well, but a lucky number may never have been a relevant topic of discussion in the relationship.

The uncertainty reduction instrument developed for this investigation was a ten-item, seven-interval, Likert-type measurement. Subjects were asked to indicate how certain/knowledgeable they were about the designated target person, in areas of behaviors, emotional states, feelings, and interests (see Figure C).

Factor analysis of the uncertainty reduction instrument produced two different viable factor structures that were interpretable (see Table 4). The rotated varimax orthogonal solution yielded a viable two-factor solution meeting the 1.0 eigenvalue criterion, accounting for 71% of the variance. Six items loaded on the first factor and four items on the second factor (see Table 4). The internal reliability for the first factor was .89 and for the second factor it was .92. However, since a unidimensional scale was sought, the unrotated solution was examined and was slightly more reliable. Furthermore, all items loaded above .51 with all but one item loading above .74 on the first factor of the unrotated solution (see Table 4). An Alpha-Cronbach internal reliability estimate of .92 was obtained for the unidimensional scale. Therefore, the unidimensional scale was used in the hypotheses testing (see Table 1 for scale summary statistics and see Table 8 for item-total correlations).

Operationalization of Feeling Good

The feeling good measure developed for this study was a 14-item, seven-interval, semantic differential-type scale. Subjects were asked to indicate how they feel about themselves when relating to the designated target person (see Figure D).

Factor analysis of the feeling good instrument produced an unrotated unidimensional solution (see Table 5 for factor loadings) with no loading under .70 on the first factor. Only one factor had an eigenvalue above 1.0 and the one factor solution accounted for 72 percent of the variance of the items (see Table 5). Split-half internal reliability of .96 was computed (see Table 1 for scale summary statistics and Table 8 for item-total correlations).

Operationalization of Interpersonal Attraction

Interpersonal attraction was measured with a 12-item, seven interval, Likert-type instrument developed by McCroskey and McClain (1972) (see Figure E). Both orthogonal and oblique factor analysis produced a viable three-factor solution as previously reported by McCroskey and McCain (1972): social attraction, task attraction, and physical attraction (see Table 6). Reliabilities using Nunnally's (1967) internal reliability formula on each dimension of the interpersonal attraction measure were the following: social attraction = .86, task attraction = .79, and physical attraction = .88 (see Table 1 for scale summary statistics).

Operationalization of Relational Safety

A 12-item, seven-interval, semantic differential-type scale was developed to assess relational safety (see Figure D). Factor analysis of the safety instrument produced an unrotated unidimensional solution (see Table 7 for factor loadings) with all items loading above .55. One item, however, loaded

higher on a second factor than on the first and it appeared to not be operating as conceptualized. Therefore, this item was deleted and another factor analysis was performed (see Table 7). This unrotated solution yielded a unidimensional solution with all items loading above .55 with this solution accounting for 58% of the variance in the items (see Table 7). Split-half reliability of .90 was computed for the revised eleven-item instrument (see Table 1 for scale summary statistics and Table 8 for item-total correlations).

Operationalization of Self-Disclosure

Scales measuring reported self-disclosure consisted of 31, seven-interval, Likert-type statements (Wheeless, 1978) (see Figure F). The instrument was reported to have five factors with adult populations. Factor reliabilities reported in a previous investigation (Wheeless, 1978) were: amount, .88; consciously intended disclosure, .85; positiveness-negativeness of revealed information, .91; honesty-accuracy, .87; and general depth or intimacy of disclosure, .84.

The Wheeless (1978) 31-item scale was submitted to a confirmatory oblique factor analysis. Confirmatory oblique factor analysis produced a reliable five-dimensional solution as previously demonstrated by Wheeless (1978). Reliabilities using Nunnaly's (1967) internal reliability formula for each dimension of self-disclosure were: intended self-disclosure, .75; amount of disclosure, .85; positiveness-negativeness of disclosure, .85; depth of disclosure, .79; and honesty-accuracy of disclosure, .83.

Statistical Analysis

Each hypothesis was tested initially by means of a multiple regression procedure. Because the relationship type variable was a nominal scale in which observations were assignable to mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories, a dummy coding procedure was utilized in order to render the knowledge

implicit in relationships of various types (Cohen & Cohen, 1975). For each hypothesis, a multiple correlation coefficient (R^2) was determined utilizing the dummy coded relationship-type as the independent variable (predictor variable). Using Fisher's protected t procedure, F values were assessed and statistically tested for each multiple correlation coefficient prior to further analysis (Cohen and Cohen, 1975). For these R^2's which were significantly different from zero ($p<.05$) power was assessed[4] and an estimation of the true population correlation coefficient (skrunken R^2) was computed.[5]

In addition, to test the subhypotheses, t tests of differences between groups were computed utilizing the partial regression coefficients for each dummy coded group. Analyses were computed for each of the following pairs of relationship types: intimate with casual acquaintance; intimate with business/professional; friendship with casual acquaintance; and friendship with business/professional.

Results

Hypothesis 1, utilizing perceived interpersonal solidarity as the dependent variable, was confirmed. Relationship types accounted for 55% of the variance in interpersonal solidarity ($F = 43.46$; df. = 4,156; $p < .0001$). Power was computed to be greater than .99 ($n = 160$, $k_B = 5$, $\alpha = .05$) and the estimate of $\tilde{R}^2$ was computed to be .51.

More specifically each of the subhypotheses were confirmed. H_{1a} - Intimate relationships produced significantly greater interpersonal solidarity than did casual acquaintances ($t = 8.39$, df = 156; $p < .01$). H_{1b} - Friendships produced significantly more interpersonal solidarity than did casual acquaintances ($t = 5.699$, df. = 156; $p < .01$) and H_{1c} - Intimate relationships produced significantly greater interpersonal solidarity than did business/professional ($t = 10.38$; df = 156; $p < .01$), and, H_{1o} - Friendships produced significantly more

interpersonal solidarity than did business/professional ($t = 5.78$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$).

Hypothesis 2, which utilized attitude-value homophily as the dependent variable, was confirmed twenty five percent of the variance in attitude value homophily was accounted for by a linear combination of relationship types ($F = 13.39$; d.f. = 156; $p < .0001$). Power of the test was computed to be greater than .99 ($n = 160$; $k_B = 5$, $\alpha = .05$) and the estimate of the true population correlation coefficient was found to be .23.

Each of the subhypotheses concerning differences in perceived attitude-value homophily between relationship types, was confirmed. H_{2A} - attitude-value homophily is perceived to be greater in intimate than in casual acquaintance relationships ($t = 3.71$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$). H_{2B} - Friendships produce greater attitude value homophily than do casual acquaintanceships ($t = 2.94$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$) H_{2C} - attitude-value homophily is perceived to be greater in intimate than in business/professional relationships ($t = 5.29$, d.f. = 156, $p < .01$), and, H_{2D} - friendships produce greater attitude-value homophily than do business/professional relationships ($t = 3.93$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$).

Results indicated support for Hypothesis 3, in which uncertainty reduction was utilized as the dependent variable. Relationship types accounted for 36% of the variance in uncertainty reduction ($F = 21.76$; d.f. = 4,156; $p < .0001$). Shrunken R^2 was estimated to be .34 and power was computed to be greater than .99 ($n = 160$; $k_B = 5$; $\alpha = .05$).

Subhypotheses which further described the nature of uncertainty reduction within various relationship types were all supported. H_{3A} - Uncertainty reduction is greater within intimate relationships than it is in casual acquaintances ($t = 6.38$, d.f. = 156, $p < .01$). H_{3B} - Friendships produce greater uncertainty reduction than do casual acquaintances ($t = 4.87$, d.f. = 156; $p < .01$). H_{3C} - Intimate relationships produce greater uncertainty reduction

than do business/professional relationships ($t = 7.76$, d.f. = 156, $p < .01$), and H_{3D} - uncertainty reduction is greater in friendships than in business/professional relationships ($t = 5.13$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$).

Hypothesis 4, utilizing feeling good as the dependent variable, was confirmed. Results indicated that 27% of the variance in feeling good was accounted for by relationship types ($F = 14.42$; d.f. = 4.156; $p < .0001$). Power was computed to be greater than .99 ($n = 160$; $k_B = 5$; $\alpha = .05$) and the estimate of the true population correlation coefficience was found to be .25.

Individuals in different relationship types were found to perceive different levels of feeling good, thus supporting each of the subhypotheses. H_{4A} - Intimates produce greater levels of feeling good than do casual acquaintances ($t = 4.09$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$). H_{4B} - Feeling good is perceived as greater in friendships than in casual acquaintances ($t = 2.85$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$). H_{4C} - Greater levels of feeling good are produced in intimate than in business/professional relationships ($t = 6.31$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$). H_{4B} - Friendships produce greater levels of feeling good than do business/professional relationships ($t = 4.14$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$).

Hypothesis 5, utilizing interpersonal attraction as the dependent variable, was tested independently for each of the three dimensions of interpersonal attraction. The overall hypothesis for social interpersonal attraction was confirmed. Relationship types accounted for 36% of the variance in social attraction ($F = 22.19$, d.f. = 4,156; $p < .0001$). Power was computed to be greater than .99 ($n = 160$, $k_B = 5$, $\alpha = .05$) and shrunken $\tilde{R}^2$ was estimated to be .34.

Investigation of subhypothesis demonstrated that each was confirmed H_{5A} Social - Greater social interpersonal attraction is produced in intimate than in casual acquaintance relationships ($t = 6.19$, d.f. = 156, $p < .01$).

H_{5B} Social - Friendships produce greater perceptions of social interpersonal

attraction than do casual acquaintanceships ($t = 5.26$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$). H_{5C} Social - Social interpersonal attraction is greater for intimates than for business/professional relationship members ($t = 6.38$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$) and H_{5D} Social - Social interpersonal attraction is greater in friendships than in business/professional relationships ($t = 4.75$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$).

Hypothesis 5 focusing upon the physical dimension of interpersonal attraction was confirmed. Twenty-eight percent of the variance in physical attraction was accounted for by relationship types ($F = 14.99$; d.f. = 4,156; $p < .0001$). The estimate of the true population correlation coefficient was found to be .25 and power of the test was computed to be greater than .99 ($n = 160$; $k_B = 5$; $\alpha = .05$).

Further analysis indicated that two of the subhypotheses were confirmed. H_{5A} Physical - Intimate relationships were found to produce greater physical attraction than did casual acquaintances ($t = 3.73$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$). H_{5B} Physical - No differences were found in physical attraction between friendships and casual acquaintanceships ($t = 1.31$; d.f. = 156; $p > .05$). H_{5C} Physical - Physical attraction is perceived at being greater by individuals in intimate than in business/professional relationships ($t = 6.06$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$). H_{5D} Physical - No differences in physical attractions were found between friendships and business/professional relationships ($t = 1.95$; d.f. = 156; $p > .05$).

The overall hypothesis concerning task attraction in various relationship types was confirmed. Relationship types accounted for 14% of the variance in task interpersonal attraction ($F = 6.63$, d.f. = 4,156; $p < .0001$). Power was assessed to be greater than .95 ($n = 160$; $k_B = 5$; $\alpha = .05$). and the estimate of the true population correlation coefficient was found to be .12.

Subhypotheses received varied support in further analysis. More specifically, the first two subhypotheses were confirmed. H_{5A} task - Intimates produce greater task attraction than do casual acquaintance members ($t = 4.16$;

d.f. = 156; $p < .01$). H_{5B} Task - Friendships produce greater task attraction than do casual acquaintances ($t = 3.46$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$). However, the subhypotheses concerning task attraction in business/professional relationships failed to be confirmed. Intimate relationships produced greater task attraction than did business/professional relationships, in opposition to the reverse relationship which was hypothesized ($t = 2.73$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$). No differences were found in task attraction between friendships and business/professional relationships ($t = 1.58$; d.f. = 156; $p > .05$).

Hypothesis 6, utilizing safety as the dependent variable was confirmed. Relationship types accounted for 25% of the variance in safety ($F = 13.25$; d.f. = 4,156; $p < .0001$). Power was computed to be greater than .99 and shrunken $\tilde{R}^2$ was found to be .23.

Further investigation indicated support for each of the subhypotheses. H_{6A}-Intimate relationships produce greater perceptions of safety than do casual acquaintanceships ($t = 4.83$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$). H_{6B}-Perceived safety is greater in friendships than in casual acquaintance relationships ($t = 3.51$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$). H_{6C}-Intimate relationships produce greater perceived safety than do business/professional relationships ($t = 4.47$; d.f. = 156; $p < .01$) and safety is greater in friendships than in business/professional relationships ($t = 2.23$; d.f. = 156; $p < .05$).

Hypothesis 7, utilizing the five dimensions of self-disclosure in independent analysis, failed to be confirmed. Relationship types accounted for only .5% of the variance in intent of self-disclosure ($F = .20$, d.f. = 4,156; $p > .90$). Only 1.8% of the variance in amount of self-disclosure was accounted for ($F = .69$; d.f. = 4,156; $p > .50$). Contextual variables, in the form of relationship types, accounted for 2.7% of the variance in positiveness-negativeness of self-disclosure ($F = 1.07$; d.f. = 4,156; $p > .35$). Only 4.7% of the variance was accounted for in depth of self-disclosure ($F = 1.88$;

d.f. = 4,156; $p > 10$). Relationship types accounted for 5.6% of the variance in the honesty-accuracy dimension of self-disclosure ($F = 2.28$; d.f. = 4,15[illegible]; $p > .05$).

(Table 9 provides an overall correlation matrix of each relationship type with each of the dependent variables. Table 10 provides a summary of all hypothesis tests, power analysis, and shrunken $\tilde{R}^2$ computations).

Discussion

Results of the present investigation indicated, in general, that utilization of the contextual variables in communication situations is useful in providing a more complete understanding of the perceptual variables which operate between communication participants. More specifically, knowledge of the nature of the communication context in terms of specific relationship types, including intimate, friendship, casual acquaintance, and business/professional, has been found to explain a significant proportion of the variance present within several perceptual variables.

Knowledge of relationship types is a meaningful predictor of perceived interpersonal solidarity accounting for 53% of its overall variance. In particular, participants in intimate or friendship relationships perceive themselves as being more close to their partners than do participants in more distant relationships (i.e., casual acquaintances and business/professional).

Relationship types as contextual variables are valuable predictors of perceived attitude-value homophily within communication relationships, accounting for 25% of the homophily variance. Specifically, attitude-value homophily is present to a greater degree in closer relationship types than in more distant relationships. Members of close relationships perceive that they are more similar in beliefs, values and so forth than do members of more distant relationships.

A post hoc analysis was computed to determine of what importance relationship type is in predicting the remaining two dimensions of homophily. Overall variance accounted for by relationship types in background and appearance homophily was significant (background homophily - $F = 2.68$; d.f. 4, 156; $p < .05$, and appearance homophily - $F = 3.10$; d.f. 4,156; $p < .05$). However, relationship types explained only 7% and 6 % of their respective variances. Furthermore, since neither background nor appearance homophily has been shown previously to have significantly predictive power in determining the presence of other perceptual variables, it may be that only attitude value homophily is a salient indicant of perceived similarity in a variety of communication contexts.

Relationship types seem to be an important indicant of the amount of uncertainty perceived in communication, since they accounted for 36% of the variance in uncertainty reduction. More precisely, members of intimate and friendship relationships perceive themselves to be more confident in predicting their partner's attitudes, actions, responses, and so forth than do members of casual acquaintanceships or business/professional relationships.

Perceived feeling good within a communication situation can be meaningfully predicted by relationship types. Overall, twenty seven percent of the variance in feeling good was accounted for by relationship types. More specifically, individuals tended to feel greater self-worth in situations where they are communicating with intimates or friends than they do in those situations in which they communicate with casual acquaintances or business/professional associates.

Relationship types are a meaningful predictor of each of the three dimensions of interpersonal attraction. Specifically, 36% of the variance in social attraction was accounted for in the present investigation. Social attraction was found to be present to a greater degree in more intimate

relationship types than in distant relationship types.

Relationship types accounted for 28% of the variance in physical attraction. Particularly, members of intimate relationships indicated that they were more physically attracted to their partner than did members of more distant relationships. However, individuals did not indicate a significant difference in physical attraction between friends and more distant relationship partners.

A post hoc t-test analysis of the differences between groups indicated that physical attraction is greater in intimate than friendship relationships ($t = 4.46$, d.f. = 156, $p < .01$). Thus it may be said that physical attraction works at different levels in various relationships. Individuals may perceive differing amounts of physical attraction to a partner simply because of the nature of the relationship and not necessarily because of the actual person.

Relationship type accounted for 14% of the variance in perceptions of attraction in the present investigation. Contrary to hypothesized results, intimates indicated greater task attraction for partners than did individuals in more distant relationships. Likewise, individuals indicated greater task attraction toward friends than toward casual acquaintances. However, no differences were found between friends and business/professional associates. Once again, individuals involved in intimate relationships may be so deeply ego-involved in the relationship that they tend to perceive their partner as possessing great task attraction because of the relationship type and not necessarily because of the attributes of the person in question. Making such positive evaluations of individuals' traits in order to conform to an overall positive evaluation is consistent with theories of cognitive consistency. (Festinger, 1957; Osgood & Tannanbaum, 1955; Heider, 1958) When an individual experiences an imbalance in cognitions, he/she will attempt to bring them into balance, and will be likely to change his/her evaluation of

the least salient or intense cognition. For example, if Mary is in love with Tom, but she feels that he is not physically attractive, she will be more likely to change her evaluation of his attractiveness to a more positive level than to change her overall evaluation of him.

Relationship types as a contextual variable is a valuable predictor of relational safety, accounting for 25% of its variance. Specifically, members of intimate and friendship relationships feel more secure and less threatened when in a communication situation than do members of casual acquaintance and business/professional relationships.

Examination of relationship types in the present study failed to be a meaningful predictor of the self-disclosure perceived to be present in communication situations. For each of the five dimensions of self-disclosure, relationship types failed to account for a significant proportion of the variance. It is suggested that the failure to gain significance in the present investigation is not necessarily an indication that self-disclosure operates similarly within various communication contexts. Internal reliability coefficients were found to be somewhat lower in the present investigation than they have been in previous research. As reliability of scales is reduced and frequency of error scores is increased, correlation coefficients tend to be reduced. Thus the nonsignificant correlations produced in the present investigation may be only an artifact of lowered scale reliabilities. In addition, the research packet utilized in the study was rather lengthy and the self-disclosure instruments were included at the end of the packet. Thus, a fatigue factor might have been in operation during scale completion. Future research needs to be conducted to more accurately describe the functioning of self-disclosure in various relationship types, while controlling for the present weaknesses.

In addition, future research should incorporate additional relationship

types and other contextual variables to more fully explain the operation of perceptual variables in communication and relationship development.

An examination of acquaintance time should be undertaken. Acquaintance time might be examined as a possible correlate of relationship type. This type of research may provide support for the social penetration theory, that is, longer acquaintance time leads to more intimate levels of relationships, dependent upon perceived reward/cost ratios (Altman & Taylor, 1973). However, if particular variables are taken into account (e.g., personality and contextual variables), it may be found that acquaintance time does not provide a meaningful predictor of relational development, and thus, possibly indicate the need for some type of contingency approach.

Results of the present study provide strong evidence that perceptual communication variables operate in different ways within various relationship types. However, future research should be undertaken to determine more specifically how and why these perceptual variables differ in various contexts. Competing causal models (e.g., path analysis) could be utilized to determine whether a directional explanation is appropriate. Such research may determine that relationships develop into specific types (e.g., intimate, casual acquaintance) because of the nature of the perceptual communication variables which are in operation. Alternately it may indicate that perceptual variables operate in a particular way because of the relationship type which has been developed.

NOTES

1. The six closer targer-persons were the following: Best male friend; best female friend ; boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse; father/mother; brother/sister; coworker. The eight more distant target-persons were the following: An acquaintance through an organization; parent of one of your child's best friends; supervisor/boss; neighbor; disliked person; subordinate; minister/priest/rabbi; doctor. Many of the closer targets include those used by Jourard (1971, 1964) in his research or were suggested by Brown (1965, p. 58) as persons with whom we are more likely to have solidarity. The more distant targets included a number of persons whose social roles encourage disclosure from others. In addition, an attempt was made to avoid highly distant sources that would be unrealistic for validating the concept of self-disclosure (e.g., the President, the Pope, etc.).

2. Coefficients of internal reliability were computed using the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula for split-half reliability (Wood, 1960), and Nunnally (1967) formula 6-18. Nunnally's formula

$$r_{kk} = \frac{kr_{ij}}{1 + (k - 1)r_{ij}}$$

is computed by taking the average correlation among all items in a measure multiplied by the number of items in the measure, divided by 1 plus the number of items minus one, times the average correlation. Pearson product-moment correlations are transformed to Z scores before summing in the averaging step, and the average Z score is then transformed back to the equivalent average Pearson product-moment correlation before use in Nunnally's formula (Nunnally, 1967, p. 193-194).

3. The 25-item version of the interpersonal solidarity instrument was obtained from Dr. Lawrence R. Wheeless at West Virginia University in the summer of 1978. Previous investigations have utilized the 20-item version (cf., Wheeless, 1977).

4. Power was assessed as a function of the N utilized in the study, the obtained effect size - $f^2 = \frac{R^2}{1-R^2}$ derived by dividing the multiple R^2 by $1-R^2$, and the alpha value of the obtained R^2. Power is computed using the following formula: $L = f^2 (n-k-1)$ and then an L table is utilized by finding the L value corresponding to the number of independent variables and reading the obtained power (Cohen & Cohen, 1975).

5. Estimates of the true population correlation coefficient (Shrunken $\tilde{R}^2$) were computed utilizing the following formula: $\tilde{R}^2 = 1 - (1-R^2) \frac{n-1}{n-k-1}$ (Cohen and Cohen, 1975).

REFERENCES

Altman, I. and Taylor, D. A. Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Berger, C. R. The acquaintance process revisited: Explorations in initial interaction. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, New York, November 1973(b).

Berger, C. R. & Calabrese, R. J. Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 1975, 1, 99-112.

Berger, C. R. & Larimer, M. W. When beauty is only skin deep: The effects of physical attractiveness, sex, and time on initial interaction. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, New Orleans, April 1974.

Berger, C. R. & Clatterbuck, G. W. Attitude similarity and attributional information as determinants of uncertainty reduction and interpersonal attraction. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Portland, Oregon, April 1976.

Berscheid, E. and Welster, E. H. Interpersonal attraction. 1st edition, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

_____. Interpersonal attraction. 2nd edition, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1978.

Bodaken, E. M. & Weiner, A. N. Theoretically interfacing communication contexts: Particulars, problems, and prospects. Paper presented at the meeting of the Central States Speech Communication Association, Southfield, Michigan, April, 1977.

Bodaken, E. M. & Wenburg, J. R. Communication relationships in context. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, in preparation.

Brown, R. Social psychology. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Byrne, D. The attraction paradigm. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Clatterbuck, G. W. Attributional confidence and uncertainty in initial interaction. Human Communication Research, 1979, 2, 147-157.

Cohen, J. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. New York: Academic Press, 1969.

Cohen, J. and Cohen, P. Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Pub., 1975.

Cozby, P. Self-disclosure, reciprocity, and liking. Sociometry, 1972, 35, 151-160.

Cozby, P. Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79, 73-91.

Duran, R. L. The relationships among task attraction, social attraction, and task salience. Unpublished Masters thesis, West Virginia University, 1978.

Duran, R. L. The relationship among task attraction, social attraction, and task salience. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association convention, San Antonio, 1979.

Festinger, L. A. A theory of social comparison. Human Relations, 1954, 14, 48-61.

Festinger, L. A. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957.

Garrison, J. Structural development of interpersonal solidarity: A causal process theory of relational communication. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1978.

Garrison, J. P. & Pate, L. E. Toward development and measurement of the interpersonal power construct. Journal of Psychology, 1977, 97, 95-106.

_____and Powell, R. G. Interpersonal solidarity and communication contexts: The study of relational communication in a mutual-causal paradigm. Paper presented at the annual Western Speech Communication Association convention, 1977.

Garrison, J. P., Sullivan, D. L. & Pate, L. E. Interpersonal valence dimensions as discriminators of communication contexts: An empirical assessment of dyadic linkages. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, December 1976.

Heider, F. Attitudes and cognitive organization. Journal of Psychology, 1946, 21, 107-112.

Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure and other-cathexis. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 428-431.

Jourard, S. M. The transparent self. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1964.

Jourard, S. M. The transparent self. Princeton: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1971.

Knapp, M. L. Social intercourse: From greeting to goodbye. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1978.

Landsman, T. Unpublished manuscript, University of Florida, 1973. In Jourard, S. M., Healthy Personality, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1974.

Larimer, M. W. & Berger, C. R. Interpersonal compatibility and the development of interpersonal relationships. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, December 1974.

Maslow, A. H. Toward a psychology of being, 2nd edition. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1968.

McCroskey, J. C., and McCain, T. A. The measurement of interpersonal attraction. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication convention, Honolulu, 1972.

_____, Richmond, V. P. and Daly, J. A. The development of a measure of perceived homophily in interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 1975, 1, 323-332.

_____ and Wheeless, L. R. Introduction to human communication. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976.

_____ and Richmond, V. P. The reliability and validity of scales for the measurement of interpersonal attraction and homophily. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association convention, Philadelphia, 1979.

Merton, R. Social theory and social structure (revised edition). Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Miller, G. R. and Steinberg, M. Between people. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1975.

Newcomb, T. M. The acquaintance process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

_____. Stability underlying changes in interpersonal attraction. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 376-386.

Nimmo, D. Popular images of politics. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Nunnally, J. C. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Osgood, C. E. & Tannenbaum, P. H. The principal of congruity in the prediction of attitude change. Psychological Review, 1955, 62, 42-55.

Pearce, W. B. & Sharp, S. M. Self-disclosing communication. Journal of Communication, 1973, 23, 409-425.

Pettigrew, T. Social evaluation theory: Convergences and applications. In Levine, D. (ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1967, 15, 241-311.

Prisbell, M. Criterial attributes of interpersonal solidarity. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association convention, Portland, Oregon, 1980.

_____, and Andersen, J. F. The importance of perceived homophily, uncertainty reduction, feeling good, safety, and self-disclosure in interpersonal

relationships. Paper presented at the annual Speech Communication Association convention, San Antonio, 1979.

_____. Feeling good: Conceptualization and measurement. Paper contributed at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Los Angeles, 1979.

_____. The importance of perceived homophily, uncertainty reduction, feeling good, safety, and self-disclosure in interpersonal relationships. Unpublished Master's thesis, West Virginia University, 1978.

Rogers, C. Therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships. In Koch, S. (ed.), Psychology: A study of science. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Rogers, E. M. and Bhowmik, D. K. Homophily-heterophily: Relational concepts for communication research. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1971, 34, 523-538.

_____ & Shoemaker, F. F. Communication of Innovations. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Scott, M. D. and Powers, W. G. Interpersonal communication: A question of needs. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978.

Snavely, W. B., Merker, G. E., Becker, L. & Book, V. Predictors of interpersonal communication apprehension in the acquaintance context. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, December 1976.

Taylor, D. A., Altman, I., & Wheeler, L. Self-disclosure in isolated groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26, 39-47.

Thibaut, J. W. and Kelly, H. H. The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1959.

Wheeless, L. R. Self-disclosure and interpersonal solidarity: Measurement, validation, and relationships. Human Communication Research, 1976, 3, 47-61.

_____. A follow-up study of relationships of trust, disclosure, and interpersonal solidarity. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Berlin, 1977.

_____. A follow-up study of the relationships among trust, disclosure, and interpersonal solidarity. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4, 143-157.

_____, and Andersen, J. F. An empirical test of social penetration and indices of its critical components. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Chicago, April, 1978.

_____, and Grotz, J. Self-disclosure and trust: Conceptualization, measurement, and interrelationships. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Chicago, April, 1975.

_____, and Glett, J. Conceptualization and measurement of reported self-disclosure. Human Communications Research, 1976, 3, 338-346.

Wood, D. A. Test construction. Columbus: Merrill, 1960.

Figure A

Interpersonal Solidarity Measure

In most human relationships there are greater or lesser degrees of closeness and affect. Please mark these scales to indicate how you relate to the person named. Please mark the following statements to indicate whether you (7) strongly agree; (6) agree; (5) moderately agree; (4) are undecided; (3) moderately disagree; (2) disagree; (1) strongly disagree. Record the number of your response in the space provided beside each statement.

____ We are very close to each other.
____ This person has a great deal of influence over my behavior.
____ I trust this person completely.
____ We feel very differently about most things.
____ I willingly disclose a great deal of positive and negative things about myself, honestly, and fully (in depth) to this person.
____ We do not really understand each other.
____ This person willingly discloses a great deal of positive and negative things about himself (herself), honestly and fully (in depth) to me.
____ I distrust this person.
____ I like this person much more than most people I know.
____ I seldom interact - communicate with this person.
____ I love this person.
____ I understand this person and who he (she) really is.
____ I dislike this person.
____ I interact-communicate with this person much more than with most people I know.
____ We are not very close at all.
____ We share a lot in common.
____ We do a lot of helpful things for each other.
____ I have little in common with this person.
____ I feel very close to this person.
____ We share some private way(s) of communicating with each other.
____ Our relationship satisfies an important need for affiliation with "another person".
____ There is a great deal of hostility and aggression between us.
____ This person is unwilling to accept me as a companion.
____ Certain things, objects, or symbols we have identify us as belonging to the same personal unit.
____ I feel no interpersonal need for affiliation with this person.

Figure B

Perceived Homophily Measure

Please check the appropriate space on each item that best reflects your relationship with the person designated on the previous page.

Doesn't think like me	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Thinks like me
Behaves like me	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Doesn't behave like me
Similar to me	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Different from me
Unlike me	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Like me
From social class similar to mine	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	From social class different from mine
Economic situation different from mine	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Economic situation like mine
Status like mine	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Status different from mine
Background different from mine	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Background similar to mine
Morals unlike mine	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Morals like mine
Sexual attitudes unlike mine	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Sexual attitudes like mine
Shares my values	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Doesn't share my values
Treats people like I do	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Doesn't treat people like I do
Looks similar to me	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Looks different from me
Different size than I am	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Same size I am
Appearance like mine	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Appearance unlike mine
Doesn't resemble me	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Resembles me

Figure C

Uncertainty Reduction Measure

Please fill out the following scale to indicate how certain/knowledgeable you are about the designated person.

How well can you predict this person's behavior?
Extremely well:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Not at all

How well do you know this person?
Not at all:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Extremely well

How well can you predict this person's emotional states?
Extremely well:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Not at all

How well do you understand this person's feelings?
Extremely well:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Not at all

How well can you predict this person's decisions?
Extremely well:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Not at all

How well do you know this person's interests?
Not at all:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Extremely well

How well can you predict this person's attitudes/values?
Not at all:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Extremely well

How well do you know this person's likes/dislikes?
Not at all:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Extremely well

How well do you understand this person's judgments?
Extremely well:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Not at all

How well can you predict this person's responses?
Not at all:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Extremely well

Figure D

State Relational Safety Measure

Please check the appropriate space on each item which you think best describes the nature of the relationship between you and the designated person.

safe:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:unsafe
irrational:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:rational
insecure:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:secure
sure:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:unsure
vulnerable:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:invulnerable
threatened:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:unthreatened
straightforward:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:tricky
not deceptive:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:deceptive
restricted:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:not restricted
unguarded:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:guarded
logical:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:illogical
able to be harmed:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:not able to be harmed

State Feeling Good Measure

Please check the appropriate space on each item to best reflect how you feel about yourself when you are relating to the designated person.

good:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:bad
valuable:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:worthless
positive:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:negative
admirable:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:deplorable
happy:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:sad
gloomy:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:cheerful
unpleasant:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:pleasant
interesting:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:uninteresting
satisfied:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:dissatisfied
attractive:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:unattractive
confident:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:not confident
exuberant:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:repressed
capable:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:incapable
heightened:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:reduced

Figure E

Interpersonal Attraction Measure

This set of scales is composed of 12 statements regarding your feelings about the individual circled on the first page. Indicate the degree to which these statements reflect your feelings about the individual by marking whether you: 7 strongly agree, 6 agree, 5 moderately agree, 4 are undecided, 3 moderately disagree, 2 disagree, 1 strongly disagree. Mark the appropriate number of your response in the space provided.

I think s(he) could be a friend of mine.

It would be difficult to meet and talk with him/her.

S(he) just wouldn't fit into my circle of friends.

We could never establish a personal friendship with each other.

I think s(he) is quite handsome(pretty).

S(he) is very sexy looking.

I find him/her very attractive physically.

I don't like the way s(he) looks.

S(he) would be a typical goof-off when assigned a job to do.

I have confidence in his/her ability to get the job done.

If I wanted to get things done I could probably depend on him/her.

I couldn't get anything accomplished with him/her.

Relationship-type Measure

Your relationship to the designated person is best described as: (circle one)

Intimate Relationship

Friendship Relationship

Casual Acquaintance

Business/Professional Relationship

Other (specify) _____

Figure F

Self-Disclosure Measure

Please mark the following statements to reflect how you communicate with the person designated on this survey. Indicate the degree to which the following statements reflect how you communicate with this person specifically by marking whether you (7) strongly agree; (6) agree; (5) moderately agree; (4) are undecided; (3) moderately disagree; (2) disagree; (1) strongly disagree. Record the number of your response in the space provided. Work quickly and just record your first impressions.

____ When I wish, my self-disclosures are always accurate reflections of who I really am.
____ When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I am doing and saying.
____ When I reveal my feelings about myself, I consciously intend to do so.
____ When I am self-disclosing, I am consciously aware of what I am revealing.
____ I do not often talk about myself.
____ My statements of my feelings are usually brief.
____ I usually talk about myself for fairly long periods at a time.
____ My conversation lasts the least time when I am discussing myself.
____ I often talk about myself.
____ I often discuss my feelings about myself.
____ Only infrequently do I express my personal beliefs and opinions.
____ I usually disclose positive things about myself.
____ On the whole, my disclosures about myself are more negative than positive.
____ I normally reveal "bad" feelings I have about myself.
____ I normally express my "good" feelings about myself.
____ I often reveal more undesirable things about myself than desirable things.
____ I usually disclose negative things about myself.
____ On the whole, my disclosures about myself are more positive than negative.
____ I intimately disclose who I really am, openly and fully in my conversation.
____ Once I get started, my self-disclosures last a long time.
____ I often disclose intimate, personal things about myself without hesitating.
____ I feel that I sometimes do not control my self-disclosure of personal or intimate things I tell about myself.
____ Once I get started, I intimately and fully reveal myself in my self-disclosures.
____ I cannot reveal myself when I want to because I do not know myself thoroughly enough.
____ I am often not confident that my expressions of my own feelings, emotions, and experiences are true reflections of myself.
____ I always feel completely sincere when I reveal my own feelings and experience.
____ My self-disclosures are completely accurate reflections of who I really am.
____ I am not always honest in my self-disclosure.
____ My statements about my own feelings, emotions, and experiences are always accurate self-perceptions.
____ I am always honest in my self-disclosures.
____ I do not always feel completely sincere when I reveal my own feelings, emotion, behaviors or experiences.

Table 1

Scale Summary Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Internal Reliability
Attitude-value Homophily	162	37.52	11.17	.90
Background Homophily	162	18.76	6.01	.73
Appearance Homophily	162	12.35	6.35	.82
Uncertainty Reduction	162	53.56	11.90	.92
Feeling Good	162	80.99	15.75	.96
Safety	162	58.89	11.52	.90
Intended Self-Disclosure	158	21.56	3.62	.75
Amount of Self-Disclosure	158	24.07	8.37	.86
Positiveness-Negativeness of Self-Disclosure	158	34.89	7.09	.85
Depth of Self-Disclosure	158	14.93	5.88	.79
Honesty of Self-Disclosure	158	39.90	7.97	.83
Solidarity	162	124.94	33.52	.96
Social Attraction	162	23.33	5.48	.86
Physical Attraction	162	19.58	5.55	.88
Task Attraction	162	24.82	4.04	.79
Intimate	62			
Friendship	50			
Casual Acquaintance	7			
Business/Professional	25			
Other	16			

Table 2

Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
For Two-Factor Solution Interpersonal Solidarity - 25 Items

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	.90	.11
Item 2	.68	.32
Item 3	.76	-.16
Item 4	-.72	.22
Item 5	.76	.19
Item 6	-.76	.27
Item 7	.63	.31
Item 8	-.73	.44
Item 9	.81	.15
Item 10	-.81	.01
Item 11	.83	.07
Item 12	.82	-.04
Item 13	-.76	.33
Item 14	.80	.21
Item 15	-.88	-.04
Item 16	.85	.08
Item 17	.86	-.02
Item 18	-.85	.03
Item 19	.94	.04
Item 20	.74	.39
Item 21	.77	.21
Item 22	-.66	.45
Item 23*	-.45	.52
Item 24	.58	.17
Item 25	-.82	.01

*Item failed to meet criterion.

Table 2 (continued)

Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
For Two-Factor Solution Interpersonal Solidarity - 24 Items

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	-.90	.09
Item 2	.69	.29
Item 3	.76	-.17
Item 4	-.71	.23
Item 5	.77	.16
Item 6	-.75	.25
Item 7	.64	.27
Item 8	-.73	.48
Item 9	.81	.15
Item 10	-.81	.04
Item 11	.83	.04
Item 12	.82	-.04
Item 13	-.75	.41
Item 14	.80	.23
Item 15	-.89	-.01
Item 16	.85	.08
Item 17	.86	-.04
Item 18	-.84	.01
Item 19	.94	.03
Item 20	.75	.41
Item 21	.76	.25
Item 22	-.66	.49
Item 24	.58	.18
Item 25	-.82	.02
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Eigenvalues	14.78	1.33
Cumulative percentage of Eigenvalues	.62	.67

Rotated Orthogonal Factor Matrix
For Three-Factor Solution Perceived Homophily

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Item 1	-.77	-.16	-3.19E-06
Item 2	.75	.10	-.28
Item 3	.82	.24	-.15
Item 4	-.77	-.30	.16
Item 5	.21	.06	-.76
Item 6	-.01	-.001	.76
Item 7	.25	.06	-.69
Item 8	-.19	-.25	.65
Item 9	-.70	.06	.24
Item 10	-.65	.08	.12
Item 11	.80	.05	-.10
Item 12	.65	.20	-.12
Item 13	.11	.84	-.09
Item 14	.01	-.63	-.003
Item 15	.24	.76	-.11
Item 16	-.15	-.87	.16

Rotated Oblique Factor Matrix For
Three-Factor Solution Perceived Homophily

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Item 1	-.77	-.28	.17
Item 2	.80	.26	-.43
Item 3	.86	.39	-.34
Item 4	-.82	-.44	.33
Item 5	.35	.18	-.79
Item 6	-.15	-.08	.74
Item 7	.37	.18	-.72
Item 8	-.34	-.35	.69
Item 9	-.72	-.08	.37
Item 10	-.64	-.05	.24
Item 11	.80	.19	-.26
Item 12	.68	.32	-.27
Item 13	.24	.85	-.19
Item 14	-.03	-.61	.05
Item 15	.36	.80	-.23
Item 16	-.31	-.90	.27
Eigenvalues	5.89	2.18	1.64
Cumulative percentages of Eigenvalues	.37	.50	.60

Table 3 (continued)

Interfactor Correlations

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Factor 1	1.000	.324	-.381
Factor 2	.324	1.000	-.232
Factor 3	-.381	-.232	1.000

Table 4

Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
for Two-Factor Solution Uncertainty Reduction

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	-.76	.28
Item 2	.75	-.15
Item 3	-.80	.37
Item 4	-.82	.22
Item 5	-.82	.27
Item 6	.83	.39
Item 7	.76	.50
Item 8	.83	.40
Item 9	-.51	.44
Item 10	.78	.28

Rotated Orthogonal Factor Matrix
for Two-Factor Solution Uncertainty Reduction

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	-.74	-.34
Item 2	.63	.42
Item 3	-.83	-.30
Item 4	-.74	-.42
Item 5	-.78	-.38
Item 6	.31	.87
Item 7	.19	.89
Item 8	.31	.87
Item 9	-.67	-.05
Item 10	.36	.75
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Eigenvalues	5.94	1.20
Cumulative percentage of Eigenvalues	.59	.71

Table 5

Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
for Two-Factor Solution Feeling Good

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	.87	-.19
Item 2	.86	.07
Item 3	.90	-.17
Item 4	.83	-.21
Item 5	.90	-.22
Item 6	-.88	.20
Item 7	-.91	.17
Item 8	.74	.33
Item 9	.88	-.03
Item 10	.70	.55
Item 11	.82	.32
Item 12	.84	.09
Item 13	.82	.10
Item 14	.85	-.07
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Eigenvalues	10.03	.78
Cumulative percentage of Eigenvalues	.72	.77

Table 6

Rotated Orthogonal Factor Matrix
For Three-Factor Solution Interpersonal Attraction

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Item 1	.43	-.26	-.70
Item 2	-.26	.02	.80
Item 3	.01	.30	.78
Item 4	-.20	.22	.84
Item 5	.20	-.87	-.11
Item 6	.04	-.88	-.17
Item 7	.11	-.85	-.17
Item 8	-.31	.62	.36
Item 9	.67	.01	.03
Item 10	.80	-.15	-.12
Item 11	.80	-.23	-.31
Item 12	-.61	.19	.39

Rotated Oblique Factor Matrix
For Three-Factor Solution Interpersonal Attraction

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Item 1	.62	-.46	-.82
Item 2	-.43	.22	.83
Item 3	-.21	.44	.80
Item 4	-.42	.41	.89
Item 5	.36	-.90	-.34
Item 6	.22	-.89	-.36
Item 7	.29	-.88	-.38
Item 8	-.48	.72	.55
Item 9	-.65	.12	.19
Item 10	.82	-.29	-.34
Item 11	.88	-.40	-.53
Item 12	-.71	.35	.55
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Eigenvalues	5.44	1.74	1.27
Cumulative percentage of Eigenvalues	.45	.60	.70

Table 6 (continued)

Interfactor Correlations

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Factor 1	1.000	-.348	-.474
Factor 2	-.348	1.000	.436
Factor 3	-.474	.436	1.000

Table 7

Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
for Two-Factor Solution Safety

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	.87	.19
Item 2	-.84	-.13
Item 3	-.89	-.09
Item 4	.87	.05
Item 5	-.56	.20
Item 6	-.76	.002
Item 7	.81	.28
Item 8	.67	.05
Item 9	-.63	.55
Item 10*	.60	-.61
Item 11	.72	.34
Item 12	-.65	.12

*Item failed to meet criterion.

Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
for Two-Factor Solution Safety

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	-.88	-.04
Item 2	.84	-.02
Item 3	.90	.10
Item 4	-.87	-.06
Item 5	.56	.55
Item 6	.77	.27
Item 7	-.82	.27
Item 8	-.66	.45
Item 9	.61	.28
Item 11	-.73	.42
Item 12	.64	-.04
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Eigenvalues	6.37	.92
Cumulative percentages of Eigenvalues	.58	.66

Table 8

Item-total Correlations

Safety		Feeling Good	
Item 1	-.84	Item 1	-.87
Item 2	.81	Item 2	-.86
Item 3	.88	Item 3	-.89
Item 4	-.85	Item 4	-.83
Item 5	.38	Item 5	-.90
Item 6	.75	Item 6	.88
Item 7	-.81	Item 7	.91
Item 8	-.69	Item 8	-.75
Item 9	.64	Item 9	-.88
Item 10*	---	Item 10	-.71
Item 11	-.73	Item 11	-.83
Item 12	.67	Item 12	-.85
		Item 13	-.82
		Item 14	-.85

Uncertainty Reduction	
Item 1	-.74
Item 2	.74
Item 3	-.79
Item 4	-.82
Item 5	-.81
Item 6	.84
Item 7	.76
Item 8	.83
Item 9	-.54
Item 10	.78

*Item 10 omitted from study.

Table 9
Correlation Matrix

	Interpersonal Solidarity	Attitude-Value Homophily	Social Interpersonal Attraction	Physical Interpersonal Attraction	Task Interpersonal Attraction	Feeling Good	Safety	Uncertainty	Intent	Amount	Positiveness-Negativeness	Depth	Honesty-Accuracy
RT1 (Intimate	.594	.348	.40	.50	.249	.402	.389	.401	-.005	.109	-.009	.198	-.029
RT2 (Friendship)	.014	.125	.15	-.128	.045	.061	.034	.04	.009	-.005	-.027	-.039	.041
RT3 (Casual Acquaintance)	-.338	-.182	-.318	-.138	-.216	-.193	-.254	-.327	-.034	-.072	-.140	-.008	-.148
RT4 (Business/ Professional)	-.405	-.281	-.307	-.258	-.129	-.337	-.184	-.412	.052	-.078	.061	-.119	-.082
RT5 (Other)	-.200	-.198	-.19	-.20	-.073	-.071	-.196	-.023	.041	.017	.068	-.086	-.162

Dependent Variable

Hypothesis Test

Table 10
Hypothesis Tests

Self-Disclosure

	Solidarity	Attitude-Value Homophily	Social Attraction	Physical Attraction	Task Attraction	Feeling Good	Safety	Uncertainty	Intent	Amount	Positiveness-Negativeness	Depth	Honesty-Accuracy
Multiple R^2	.53	.25	.36	.28	.14	.27	.25	.36	.005	.018	.027	.047	.056
F Value	43.46***	13.39***	22.19***	14.99***	6.63***	14.42***	13.25***	21.76***	.20	.69	1.07	1.88	2.28
Power	7.99	7.99	7.99	7.99	7.95	7.99	7.99	7.99					
Shrunken R^2	.51	.23	.34	.25	.12	.25	.23	.34					
T-tests													
RT1-RT3	8.39**	3.71**	6.19**	3.73**	4.16**	4.09**	4.83**	6.38**					
RT1-RT4	10.38**	5.29**	6.38**	6.06**	2.73**	6.31**	4.47**	7.76**					
RT2-RT3	5.69**	2.94**	5.26**	1.31	3.46**	2.85**	3.51**	4.87**					
RT2-RT4	5.78**	3.93**	4.75**	1.95	1.58	4.14**	2.23*	5.13*					

* denotes $p < .05$
** denotes $p < .01$
*** denotes $p < .0001$